A CARACTER OF CONTRACT	`			Patent and Tra Address: COMMIS	Idemark Office SIONER OF PATENT ton, D.C. 20231	TS AND TRADEMARKS
L F	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAM	ED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
	09/328,939	06/09/99	FUJIMURA		S	18867-000410
	_			-		EXAMINER
	020350 TOWNSEND AN TWO EMBARCA EIGHTH FLOO SAN FRANCIS	ADERO CENTE )R	ER .	12 '	AHMED, ART UNIT 1746 DATE MAILED:	S PAPER NUMBER U 03/12/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

-----

i

		Application N .	Applicant(s)				
		09/328,939	FUJIMURA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Shamim Ahmed	1746				
<del>_</del> _	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address				
eriod fo	r Reply DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	V IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH	(S) FROM				
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur	DRIENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR KEPT MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep period for reply sispecified above, the maximum statutory period e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu sply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the annication to become ABANDONE	imely filed ys will be considered timely. 1 the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) 🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09	) <u>June 1999</u> .					
2a)		This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
•	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application	on.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>12-20</u> is/are withdra	awn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claims are subject to restriction and	/or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are objecte	d to by the Examiner.					
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) disa	pproved.				
12)							
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).				
	$\square$ All b) Some * c) None of:						
3	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.					
	2 Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in Applica	ation No				
-	3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a l	riority documents have been recein Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ived in this National Stage				
14)⊠	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for do	pmestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(e).				
Attachme			many (BTO 412) Banar No(c)				
16) 1 N	ntice of References Cited (PTO-892) ntice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	a) 19) 🔲 Notice of Inform	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

\_

\_\_\_\_\_

-

ł

### DETAILED ACTION

### **Election/Restrictions**

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a method, classified in class 216, subclass 67.

II. Claims 12-20, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 156, subclass 345.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed could be practiced by another apparatus, wherein the inner wall of the discharge area can comprise other than silicon nitride material.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Richard Ogawa on 2/28/2001 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-11.
Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 12-20 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: At page 4 of the specification, the brief description of the drawings 2-6 and 7-8 is not proper because each figure has to explain individually. Correction is required. See MPEP 608.01(b).

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In claim 8, line 3, " total Gas-C flow is defined as the ratio of amount of hydrogen atom in Gas-B to that in Gas-A is larger than 1/480" is not described in the specification.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, lines 1-2, " downstream position of a plasma source" is indefinite because applicant is claiming a relative position, no reference point is given. Is the "downstream position of a plasma" with relative to the material surface?

In claim 2, line 2-3, "setting objective surface in downstream of the gas-D injection" is not clear because the word "objective" is indefinite.

In claims 3-5, line 1, "the molecule" is indefinite because it is not clear is this the molecule of Gas-A or Gas-B, since the Gas-C comprises a Gas-A molecule and a Gas-

B (see, claim 1, line 3-5).

11. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the molecule" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### **Double Patenting**

12. Applicant is advised that should claim 6 be found allowable, claim 7 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 1 –9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Moslehi (USP 5,089,441).

Moslehi teaches a dry cleaning process, wherein a gas mixture of hydrogen gas and a

halogen containing gas such as HCI or HBr or HF is used to enhance the cleaning

process, assuming hydrogen is Gas-A and halogen containing gas is Gas-B (col.7, lines

9-18). Moslehi also teaches that some of the gases can be introduced in the

downstream of the plasma as non-plasma state into the process chamber, assuming

Gas-D (col.5, lines 10-20).

As to the reference of 9 and 11, Moslehi teaches HF and silane are introduced as a

process gas (col.7, lines 10-18 and 54-60).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 5

16. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moslehi in view of Grill (Cold Plasma in Materials Fabrication).

Moslehi discussed in the above paragraph No. 13 but fails to teach the introduction of a gas containing carbon as its element in the downstream of the plasma.

However, Grill discloses an etching process of removing silicon oxide utilizing a gas mixture of hydrogen and CF<sub>4</sub>, which is well known in the art (page 230-231 and table 8-

2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of claimed invention to combine Grill's teaching into Moslehi's method because this is conventional to use a gas containing carbon element as taught by Grill.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shamim Ahmed whose telephone number is (703) 305-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-5:30) Every Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (703) 308-4333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7718 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final

communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

> Shamim Ahmed Examiner Art Unit 1746

SA March 8, 2001

يت م

FRANKIE L. STINSON PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 3400